Atty Docket No. 02307K-141312US

PTO FAX NO.:

703-872-9306

ATTENTION:

Examiner Thaian N. Ton

TELEPHONE NO.:

571-272-0736

Group Art Unit 1632

RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 1 2 2004

OFFICIAL COMMUNICATION

FOR THE PERSONAL ATTENTION OF

EXAMINER

CERTIFICATION OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that the following documents in re Application of Charles L. Sawyers et al., Application No. 10/022,115, filed December 14, 2001 for MICE MODELS OF HUMAN PROSTATE CANCER PROGRESSION are being facsimile transmitted to the Patent and Trademark Office on the date shown below.

Document(s) Attached

- 1. Response to Restriction Requirement
- copy of Revocation of Power of Attorney with New Power and Change of Correspondence Address already filed in this case

Number of pages being transmitted, including this page: 6

Dated: April 12, 2004

PLEASE CONFIRM RECEIPT OF THIS PAPER BY RETURN FACSIMILE AT (415) 576-0300

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor San Francisco, CA 94111-3834 Telephone: 415-576-0200

Fax: 415-576-0300

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the United States Patent and Trademark Office. Fax No. 1-703-872-9306 on January 2004

<u>PATENT</u> Attorney Docket no. 02307K-1413-12US Client ref. no. 96-540-4

RECEIVED CENTRAL FAX CENTER

APR 1 2 2004

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re application of:

Sawyers et al.

Application No.: 10/022,115

Filed: December 14, 2001

For: MICE MODELS OF HUMAN PROSTATE CANCER PROGRESSION

Customer No.: 20350

Confirmation No. 4057

Examiner:

Thaian N. Ton

Art Unit:

1632

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION

REQUIREMENT

Commissioner for Patents P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Office Action mailed March 10, 2004, Applicants elect Group I, claims 21-26, drawn to methods for assess the effect of a composition or treatment on human prostate cancer using an immune deficient mouse comprising a human prostate cancer xenograft. The foregoing election is made with traverse.

According to the MPEP, where claims can be examined together without undue burden, the Examiner must examine the claims on the merits even though they are directed to independent and distinct inventions. See, the MPEP at 803.01. In establishing that an "undue burden" would exist for co-examination of claims, the Examiner must show that examination of the claims would involve substantially different prior art searches, making the co-examination burdensome. Applicants respectfully submit that as the inventions in the five Groups are related, examination of the three groups together would not create an undue burden. Applicants therefore respectfully request withdrawal of the restriction requirement.

Applicant: Sawyers et al. Application No.: 10/022,115

Page 2

PATENT

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 415-576-0200.

Respectfully submitted,

Reg. No. 44,879

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor San Francisco, California 94111-3834 Tel: 415-576-0200

Fax: 415-576-0300

JML/mcd 60192182 v1